REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 21-23, and 25-29 were pending prior to the final Office Action. Claims 4, 12, 19, 27, and 29 have been cancelled through this Reply. Thus, claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13, 15-17, 21-23, 25, 26, and 28 are currently pending of which claims 1, 9, 16, and 22 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 9, 16, and 22 have been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Batra, Salmon, Cheng, Lin, Chiang

A. The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 16, 17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra (U.S. Patent 6,317,061)[hereinafter "Batra"] in view of Salmon (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0048256)[hereinafter "Salmon"] and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,056,458)[hereinafter "Lin"] and Chiang (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,215)[hereinafter "Chiang"]. Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. *See M.P.E.P. 2142.* One requirement to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all claim limitations. See *M.P.E.P. 2142; M.P.E.P. 706.02(j).* Thus, if the cited references fail to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1 and 16 have been amended to further clarify that the removable section (claim 1) or the removable alphanumeric section (claim 16) is configurable in an abutment relationship with the base (claim 1) [or keyboard housing (claim 16)] for a user selectable separation process corresponding to the biometric characteristic of the user, "wherein the biometric reader is configured to send a signal so as ***to physically release the removable section*** (claim 1) [or the removable alphanumeric section (claim 16)] ***from the electro-mechanical connector responsive to the biometric characteristic of the user***, wherein ***upon***

physical release of the removable section (claim 1) [or the removable alphanumeric section (claim 16)], the ***host computer and the physically released removable section*** (claim 1) [or the removable alphanumeric section (claim 16)] ***remain operably connected to each other*** via the base (claim 1) [or keyboard housing (claim 16)] which includes a wireless receiver to receive the signal from the wireless transmitter of the removable section (claim 1) or the removable alphanumeric section (claim 16); and wherein the selectable separation process is facilitated by ***transverse grooves or channels located on the base*** (claim 1) [or keyboard housing (claim 16)] ***in substantially perpendicular to the electro-mechanical connector*** for ***slidably guiding the removable section away from the electro-mechanical connector***."

None of the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified claim feature of independent claims 1 and 16. Although Salmon teaches a finger print sensor 13 to validate and allow users to enter a keyboard 3 which is being rolled up in a cylinder 8 in its stored state, Salmon is completely silent on whether the finger print sensor 13 sends a signal to ***physically release*** the keyboard 3 from the roll up cylinder 8. In Salmon, the keyboard is ***not released from any electro-mechanical connector*** located on a base as required by claims 1 and 16. Further, if the keyboard 3 is physically removed from the base, the keyboard will 3 no longer be operably connected to a host computer.

Batra and Lin do not fulfill at least this deficiency of Salmon.

Although, Chiang teaches a portable computer 41 which includes a sunken socket 42 to receive a removable keyboard 40, Chiang fails to teach or suggest "wherein the selectable separation process is facilitated by ***transverse grooves or channels located on the base in substantially perpendicular to the electro-mechanical connector*** for ***slidably guiding the removable section away from the electro-mechanical connector***."

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and 16 are not rendered unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon, Lin, and Chiang.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable over Batra, Salmon, Lin, and Chiang. Dependent claims 2, 6-8, 17, and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

B. Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon, and further in view of Lin (US 6,529,145) [hereinafter "Lin '145"] and Lin. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claims 9 and 22 now recite, *inter alia*, "a second keyboard housing (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)]. . . to a ***electro-mechancial connector*** located on the first keyboard housing (claim 9) [or the keyboard housing (claim 22)] . . . and is configurable in an abutment relationship with the first keyboard housing (claim 9) [or the keyboard housing (claim 22)] for a user selectable separation process corresponding to the biometric characteristic of the user to trigger a stand-alone self-powered mode to trigger an input to a processor link for user-based input with the second key-board housing (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)], wherein the biometric reader is configured to send an electrical signal to facilitate ***physical release*** of the second keyboard housing (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)] from the ***electro-mechanical connector*** responsive to the biometric characteristic of the user, wherein upon ***physical release of the second keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)], ***the first keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or the keyboard housing (claim 22)] ***and the physically released second keyboard housing remain*** (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)] ***operably connected to each other*** via a wireless receiver located on the first keyboard housing to receive a signal from a wireless transmitter located on the second keyboard housing (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)]; and wherein the selectable separation process is facilitated by ***transverse grooves or channels located on the first keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or the keyboard housing (claim 22)] ***in substantially perpendicular to the electro-mechanical connector for slidably guiding the second keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)] ***away from the electro-mechanical connector***." *Emphasis added.*

It is respectively submitted that none of the cited prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified claim feature of independent claims 9 and 22.

Although Salmon teaches a finger print sensor 13 to validate and allow users to enter a keyboard 3 which is being rolled up in a cylinder 8 in its stored state, Salmon is completely silent on whether the finger print sensor 13 sends an electrical signal to ***physically release*** the keyboard 3 from the roll up cylinder 8. In Salmon, the keyboard is ***not released from any electro-mechanical connector*** as required by claims 9 and 22. Further, if the keyboard 3 is physically removed from the base, the keyboard will 3 no longer be operably connected to a host computer.

Batra, Lin '145, and Lin do not fulfill at least this deficiency of Salmon. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 9 and 22 are not rendered unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon and Lin '145, and further in view of Lin.

Dependent claims 10, 13, 15, and 23 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

C. Dependent claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon and further in view of Lin and Chiang as applied to claims 1, and further in view of Cheng (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0174123)[hereinafter "Cheng"]. Dependent claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon, Lin ('145) and Lin ('458) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Cheng. Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon, Lin ('145) and Lin ('458) as applied to claims 9 and 22 above, and further in view of Chiang. Claims 27 and 29 have been cancelled through this Reply rendering the rejection of these claims as moot. Note that some features of claims 27 and 29 have now been incorporated into claims 9 and 22, respectively. However, it is respectfully submitted that Chiang fails to teach or suggest "wherein the selectable separation process is facilitated by ***transverse grooves or channels located on the first keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or the keyboard housing (claim 22)] ***in substantially perpendicular to the electro-mechanical connector for slidably guiding the second keyboard housing*** (claim 9) [or a removable keyboard portion (claim 22)] ***away from the electro-mechanical connector***."

Claims 5 and 25 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By #58,755
for Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant